

**REMARKS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the Examiner Interview on September 25, 2007, and for carefully considering this application.

**Disposition of Claims**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-11, 13, 14, 16-20, and 22-25 were pending in this application. By way of this reply, claims 4, 7, 13, 16, and 22 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 26-32 are newly added. Claims 1, 10, and 19 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 10, and 19.

**Claim Amendments**

By way of this reply, claims 1, 5, 10, 14, 19, and 25 are amended. Claims 1, 10, and 19 are amended to clarify the scope of the invention. Further, independent claims 1, 10, and 19 are amended to include some limitations of now-cancelled dependent claims 4 and 13. Dependent claims 5 and 14 are amended to depend from new claims 26 and 29, respectively. Claim 25 is amended to correct antecedent basis necessitated by amendments to claim 19. No new matter is added by way of these amendments. Support for these amendments can be found, for example, on pages 22 and 23 of the specification.

Claims 26-32 are newly added. No new matter is added by way of these new claims as support can be found, for example, in the original claims and on pages 22 and 23 of the specification.

**Rejections under U.S.C. § 103**

“The key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The Supreme Court in *KSR* noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should be made explicit.” MPEP § 2143 (referring to *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. \_\_\_, 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007)). The analysis presented by the Examiner to support the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in the Office Action mailed on October 9, 2007 shows that the Examiner found no differences between the cited prior art and the claims other than a lack of the actual combination of the elements in a single prior art reference, *i.e.*, that the Examiner is relying solely on the teachings of the prior art. See, *e.g.*, MPEP § 2143(A). Further, “all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” MPEP § 2143.03.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9-11, 13, 14, 16, 18-20, 22, 24, and 25 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0115322 (hereinafter “Moriconi”) in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0021818 (hereinafter “Singhal”). Claims 4, 7, 13, 16, and 22 are cancelled in this reply. Thus, this rejection is now moot with respect to the cancelled claims. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the remainder of the claims, the rejection is traversed.

Applicants assert that the references, when combined, fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations of amended claims 1, 10, and 19. Amend claim 1 recites, in part,

receiving a notification from said remote source of a change in said policy definition, said notification *identifying said resource*.

(Emphasis added.) Amended claims 10 and 19 recite similar limitations. In other words, claim 1, 10, and 19 require that the notification of a change in a policy definition identifies the resource that is affected by the change.

Moriconi is directed to a system and method for enforcing security requirements in a distributed network. The system disclosed by Moriconi includes a policy manager on a server in the network that manages a global security policy and an application guard on a client or client server that includes a local client security policy derived from the global security policy. When changes are made to the global security policy, “only changes to the relevant policy rules” are distributed to “the appropriate application guard, which enforces control to local applications and data.” See Moriconi, paragraph [0082]. However, Moriconi does not disclose a distribution of a notification by the policy manager that *specifies which resources* controlled by the application guard *are affected* by the change in policy definitions. In fact, there is no need for a notification of affected resources because a new policy decision is made by the application guard, using the locally stored policy rules, each time a request for a resource is made. Therefore, Moriconi cannot possibly disclose a notification identifying a resource affected by a change in a policy definition, as required by amended claims 1, 10, and 19.

Further, Singhal does not disclose what Moriconi lacks. Singhal discloses an Application Intermediation Gateway (AIG) that connects a plurality of core network elements to a plurality of network resources such as content providers, third party application providers, and partner portals. The AIG provides access to the network

resources by implementing application level policies. The decisions on the application level policies (*i.e.*, policy decisions) are provided to the AIG by a policy decision point. *See, e.g.*, Singhal, paragraph [0030]. Policy decisions received by the AIG may be locally cached in a local policy decision store to avoid requesting policy decisions every time from the policy decision point. *See, e.g.*, Singhal, paragraph [0062]. However, Singhal is completely silent regarding what happens if an application level policy at a policy decision point is changed that may affect a policy decision for a resource previously provided to the AIG. That is, Singhal does not disclose any type of procedure for notifying the AIG of a resource affected by a change in a policy definition. Thus, Singhal cannot possibly teach or suggest receiving a notification that identifies a resource affected by a change in a policy definition, as required by amended claims 1, 10, and 19.

Thus, the combination of Moriconi and Singhal cannot possibly be construed to disclose receiving a notification that identifies a resource affected by a change in a policy definition as required by the amended claims without ignoring express limitations of the claims and/or misconstruing the teachings of the prior art, both of which are wholly improper.

In view of the above, Moriconi and Singhal, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended claims 1, 10, and 19. Thus, claims 1, 10, and 19 are patentable over Moriconi and Singhal. Claims 2, 5, 9, 11, 14, 18, 20, 24, and 25, which depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 10, and 19, are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 8, 17, and 23 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriconi in view of Singhal and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 20040054791 (hereinafter "Chakraborty"). As stated above, Moriconi and Singhal fail to teach or suggest the limitations of amended claims 1, 10, and 19. Applicants assert that Chakraborty does not teach what Moriconi and Singhal lack, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on Chakraborty solely for the purpose of disclosing a period of time that policy information is valid. *See* Office Action dated October 9, 2007 at page 20.

In view of the above, Moriconi, Singhal, and Chakraborty fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of amended claims 1, 10, and 19, whether considered separately or in combination. Claims 8, 17, and 23, which depend from amended claims 1, 10 and 19, are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **New Claims**

Claims 26-32 are added by way of this reply. Claims 26-32 depend directly from claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, favorable consideration of claims 26-32 is respectfully requested.

#### **Conclusion**

Applicants believe this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at

the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226/496001; P9015).

Dated: January 7, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Robert P. Lord/  
Robert P. Lord  
Registration No.: 46,479  
OSHA · LIANG LLP  
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800  
Houston, Texas 77010  
(713) 228-8600  
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicants